



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the National and State Rights parties, the broad and strict constructionists and the pro- and anti-slavery men. Our regret is especially keen as several of these, which throw a flood of light upon the political situation of the times, are either not well known or not as accessible as is to be desired. Such, for example, are: the resolutions of the legislature of Massachusetts suggested by the annexation of Louisiana in 1803; the action of Pennsylvania calling for an impartial tribunal to try disputes between the federal and state governments, growing out of the Gideon Olmstead case; the resolutions of Pennsylvania, Ohio and other states (1811-12, 1819-21) against the constitutionality of the United States Bank; the resolutions of several of the Southern States (1826-30) declaring federal aid to internal improvements within a state unconstitutional; the resolutions of Ohio and at least seven other states (1823-25) favorable to the colonization and gradual emancipation of the slaves and the replies of Georgia and other Gulf states inimical to federal aid to colonization societies; the defiant resolutions of Georgia in connection with the Creek and Cherokee question; the call for a constitutional convention by South Carolina, Georgia and Alabama (1832-33); the strong State Rights resolutions of Massachusetts and Maine over the North-East boundary question (1830-32) and of Massachusetts relative to slavery and the annexation of Texas (1843-45), together with the counter-resolutions of the Slave States; the resolutions of positive nullification and defiance passed by the legislature of Wisconsin in 1859 in reply to the ruling of the Supreme Court in the case of *Ableman vs. Booth*; and, finally, South Carolina's Declaration of Independence in justification of the Ordinance of Secession. If necessary to secure the required space for these and similar papers, we think the editor would have been justified in omitting the four documents of the preconstitutional period, inasmuch as they are already universally accessible.

In general it may be said that the volume has been carefully planned and successfully executed. The collection, while made up of documents neither "new" nor "rare," will without doubt prove a veritable boon to those who cannot have access to a large library, and a great convenience to all students of American history.

HERMAN V. AMES.

University of Pennsylvania.

The History of South Carolina Under the Proprietary Government, 1670-1719. By EDWARD MCCRADY. Pp. xi, 762. Price, \$3.50. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1897.

This is the beginning of what bids fair to be one of the best of

our state histories. Mr. McCrady (p. 14) promises to follow this volume with the further history of the Palmetto State to the close of the American Revolution. We trust he will not stop there. No state needs to have her history written more than South Carolina, and no one is so well fitted to write that history as our author. Too many of our historical writers are too timorous or too little alive to the importance of the history of the various portions of the Union under the federal constitution and so stop their work too soon. South Carolina's history should be written down to the close of the reconstruction period in 1876, and though we should probably disagree with many things Mr. McCrady would write in the later portion of the work, we are anxious to see him undertake the task. It would be a most valuable treatise for the student of American history and politics.

This volume begins with an introductory chapter which contains the most luminous description of South Carolina's characteristics yet written and a series of interesting "evaluations" of the earlier works on the history of the state. Then follows a chronological narration and discussion of the events in the Palatinate's history, down to its becoming a crown colony. The contemporary events in England are clearly kept in mind, economic, social and religious history is not forgotten and the whole is told us in a clear and pleasant style.

The book is well indexed and there is an interesting reproduction of an old map as a frontispiece. In the next volume, I trust we may see an accurate modern map with the important places located. The appendices are most valuable. We rejoice to find a clue to that tangled web, the "Devolution of Title of the Proprietary Shares in Carolina" and so satisfactory a clue as is here given. There are most useful lists of the law officers, of Proprietary Governors, of Palatines, Landgraves, and Caciques in that complicated house of aristocracy that Locke devised. Other lists are of value, giving the returns of population, of the importation of negroes, and of the number of vessels entered.

The importance of the history of South Carolina is shown in the first paragraph of the work, which rightfully claims for that state a record of equal prominence with that of Virginia and Massachusetts. Through its great stream of emigration westward, South Carolina, in General Francis A. Walker's words, "was a beehive, from which swarms were continually going forth to populate the newer cotton-growing states." The separation of South Carolina from the other colonies is clearly pointed out. We are so accustomed to think of Virginia and South Carolina together as Southern States, that we

are almost startled to have it brought to our notice, that the latter was nearly as far from Virginia as Massachusetts was, and that navigation across the ocean to England was nearly as safe as that around the dangerous North Carolina coast to Virginia. The colony was an outpost, separated far from the other English settlements and almost within striking distance of the Spanish settlements in Florida. It was far more akin to the insular than to the continental colonies in climate, in people, in production, in its social life. It was largely settled from the Barbadoes, and so its colonial life was never crude but highly developed from the first. This is an important fact and one which partly accounts for the rapidity with which slavery and the slave code were introduced into Carolina. There was transferred to South Carolina "a colonial social system which, beginning a little later than that of Virginia, was nearly as old and as fully developed as that of Massachusetts, ready for adaptation by the new colonists from England."

The proximity to the Spanish settlement and the West Indies had other important effects. It caused the creeks and inlets of the coast to be favorite lurking places for pirates. That these were encouraged and abetted by the settlers has often been alleged, but a successful defence of the people from this charge seems to have been made by Mr. McCrady. This situation also made the colony even more military in its character than were those further to the north. One expedition after another was sent by the English colonists against St. Augustine and by the Spanish against Charleston. Damage was done to both sides, outlying settlements, like that of Lord Cardross near Port Royal were destroyed; but neither party succeeded in overthrowing the other. The narratives of these expeditions are clearly given, though they lack something in vividness. One Indian war followed another, as the tribes were instigated by the rival European settlers. The military organization of the people, made necessary by external enemies and later by the great number of savage negro slaves, is assigned by Mr. McCrady as the historic origin of the fondness of the Southerners for military titles. The isolation from other colonies "tended to limit whatever patriotism there might be, to the gradually extending area of the province, while the constant recurrence in thought and act to the central point, the town, developed and intensified the Carolina conception of the entity of the state and of its absolute sovereignty."

The word town is in the singular number, for more than any other colony South Carolina had but one centre. "Until the immigration of the Scotch-Irish and Virginians into the upper country, by the way of the mountains, from 1750 to 1760, the development

of the colony was, not as in New England, from many and distinct settlements or towns; but from one point, the circle enlarging, as the population increased, but always with reference to the one central point—the town—Charles Town." This produced a very noteworthy result, that there was no local area of administrative activity, "no such thing as a county or township government of any kind" in South Carolina for two hundred years from its settlement, and, indeed, to the close of the Civil War. We now see the basis for the strong affection for the state. So, too, the struggle of these people in behalf of strict construction of a written constitution began in the conflicts they had with the proprietors concerning the interpretation of the charter. The influx of Huguenots receives due attention, and Mr. McCrady properly points out that they are not to be counted among the dissenters. We ought never to forget that the Huguenots were members of the Reformed Church of France, the Anglicans of the Reformed Church of England. The beginnings of the influence of New England men in the South are also shown us. Some day a genealogist will show us that those who sneered at "Northern mudsills" unconsciously scorned the blood of many of the South's ablest leaders, and that these emigrants and their children absorbed fully the peculiar views of the section to which they came. We ought also to know what Mr. McCrady frankly acknowledges: "Any tradition that connects to any extent the provincial aristocracies of the Southern States with the Old World patrician origin is pure sentimental fiction; that is not only contrary to common sense and to all evidence that can be collected, but is in defiance of history itself." The English people of all the colonies came from the middle classes, and the "social order," not only of South Carolina, but also of every other colony, "has been the outgrowth of her peculiar circumstances."

We have left ourselves no space to do more than merely call attention to a few of the other interesting points in the book; the discussion of the early history of the ballot in the colony (p. 199), the claim that South Carolina prepared the first American bill of rights (p. 243), the proof that the liberality of the Fundamental Constitutions was due not to Locke, but the charter (p. 106), and the curious career of the learned and corrupt chief justice, Nicholas Trott.

There are a few errors, misprints, etc., which should be corrected in subsequent editions. The statement (p. 126) that Indians did not name rivers may be correct for South Carolina, but is not accurate as a general statement. The Algonquins named many rivers.

Sir William Talbot (p. 128) is not to be found in any list of the

governors of Maryland. The Library Act of 1700 is preserved and may be read, *in extenso*, in one of Trott's works, which seems to have escaped Mr. McCrady's notice: "The Laws of the British Plantations in America relating to the Church, the Clergy, Religion and Learning;" folio, London, 1721. The library in Charleston itself was not the first public one in America (p. 353). That honor is due either to the more or less vague early Boston Library, or to the one Dr. Bray established at Annapolis in Maryland. Rev. John Cotton (p. 335) sailed *for* and not *from* Charles Town in 1698 (Sibley's Harvard Graduates Vol I, pp. 496 *et seq.*). A *free* school has no connection with the payment of tuition by the pupils (p. 702). We should always remember that prior to this century a free school was one where liberal studies were taught. There seems to be a confusion as to the date of Governor Tynte's death: on page 487 it is given as 1710, and on page 720 as 1709.

BERNARD C. STEINER.

Johns Hopkins University.

Histoire politique de l'Europe contemporaine; Évolution des partis et des formes politiques, 1814-1896. By CH. SEIGNOBOS, Maître des Conférences à la Faculté des lettres de l'Université de Paris. Pp. xii, 814. Price, 12 fr. Paris: Armand Colin et Cie, 1897.

Perhaps the most remarkable characteristics of M. Seignobos' book are its compactness and its comprehensiveness. Within the compass of eight hundred pages are contained not only the political history of every country in Europe from 1814 to 1896, but also chapters devoted to the diplomatic and military history of Europe, to Europe in 1814, to the transformation of material conditions, to the relations between church and state, and to the evolution of socialistic and anarchistic parties and ideas. Furthermore, there is a section at the close of each chapter on political history, on the evolution of the state in question, and a final chapter on the political evolution of Europe as a whole. When there be added to the above an elaborate preface and general bibliography, special bibliographies at the end of each chapter, a table of contents and an index, it will be seen that nothing has been left undone to make the work scientifically complete.

In the preface, M. Seignobos is at considerable pains to explain the plan and method of his work. He is fully aware of the impossibility of basing such a work upon the results of direct personal investigation on account of the enormous mass of material that exists for the history of the present century; and he forewarns the reader that he has drawn his evidence from second-hand authorities, and has no intention of giving proofs for all his statements. He